

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/857,347

Applicant(s)

SITBON, ERIC

Examiner

James R. Brittain

Art Unit

3677

All Participants:

(1) James R. Brittain.

(2) Douglas E. Jackson.

Status of Application: Amended after non-final rej.

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 January 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims 13 and 26 were discussed with respect to a possible interpretation of Ellis (US 2389298 on January 5, 2004)

Claims discussed:

4, 5, 7, 8, 13-26, 34, 35, 38, 47, 49

Prior art documents discussed:

Ellis (US 2389298)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreement was reached on January 7, 2004 to amend claims 13 and 26 as indicated in the attached examiner's amendment. The final agreement returned claim 13 to its original allowed condition and added the means for locking the means for motorization in multiple positions to claim 26 and there is no suggestion to modify the elastic band 30 of Ellis to have a means for locking the band in multiple positions. Mr. Jackson requested that the dependencies of claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 14-25, 34, 35, 38, 47 and 49 be also returned to depending from claim 1 rather than claim 13 so as to be in accordance with their original dependence and I agreed to make those changes, too.